

WHO ARE AND WHO MAY BE SLAVES IN THE U. STATES.

FACTS FOR THE PEOPLE.

BY GEO. W. WESTON.

It happened once to the writer, in a railroad car, for the lack of other reading, to be driven to the study of the advertisements in the semi-weekly Richmond (Va.) Enquirer, of February 27, 1855. The advertisements of runaway-slaves were found to be numerous, and they deserve attention, as showing of what races the slaves at the South are made up.

G. R. Gibbons advertises "Lucretia," as of a "dark brown color."

Henry Bowers advertises "Mary Ann," as of "dark complexion."

Jones & Sclater advertise two runaways, "Bob" and "Joe." Of Bob it is said that he "is of a dark orange complexion." Of Joe it is said, that "he is about the same color, perhaps a little lighter."

Haxwell & Co. advertise "Otway," describing him as having a "complexion not very black."

Wm. Gray advertises "William," described as a "dark brown mulatto."

T. H. Smith, jailor of Charlotte county, advertises the committed runaway "Paul," stating that "said negro's color is dark."

E. H. Stokes advertises two runaways, "Lemuel Johnson" and "Sam." Lemuel Johnson is described as "a tall black fellow." The color of Sam is not given.

J. Lucius Davis advertises "George," "color black."

A runaway from the Byrd plantation, "Major," is described as of "ginger-cake color."

E. Fontaine advertises "Reuben" as of "black complexion."

John J. Warth advertises three runaways, exhibiting a regular gradation of colors, as follows:

1. "Billy Drew," "a dark mulatto."
2. "Ned," "a black negro."
3. "Mat," "a very black negro."

A runaway, "Phil," is advertised as belonging to the estate of Wm. Gooch, and is spoken of as follows:—

"The said negro is nearly white, with eyes blue, hair a little curly, is almost 5 feet 10 inches high, not more than 20 years old. It is believed he will en-

deavor to make his way to a free State, as he can anywhere pass for a white man."

These are all the runaways advertised in that paper. They are sixteen in number, and in all the cases with a single exception, the color is given. This is common in all Southern advertisements of that character. It does not seem to be assumed that a slave is black, but if such is the fact, it is so stated. In the advertisements quoted above, the black color is rather the exception than the rule. Of the sixteen runaways, taking color as the test of race, not exceeding four can have been of pure African stock, and one appears not to have been distinguishable from the pure Caucasian.

The writer has before him the Daily Baltimore Sun, of July 31, 1856, which has six advertisements of this description.

T. B. Robertson advertises six runaways, giving descriptions of height, &c., and adding, "all are different shades of black."

Wm. Coulbourn advertises "James Henry," as of "dark chestnut color."

Susan Goor advertises "Robert," "a colored boy."

Wm. B. Hill advertises "Charles Sprigg," described as "black."

Lawrence Posey advertises "Madison" as "of chestnut color."

P. R. Edelen advertises "Joe," as "a dull mulatto, with grey eyes."

These Southern advertisements, of which the writer has many before him, are very acute in their distinctions of color. "Yellow but not a mulatto;" "cinnamon color;" "bright mulatto;" "ginger bread color;" "about the color of a ginger cake;" these are samples.

It is not true, in law, or in fact, that the condition of slavery at the South, is confined to the African race. The principle of American slavery which distinguishes it from the slavery of patriarchal times, and from oriental slavery at this day, is, that where the mother is enslaved, the offspring follow the condition of the mother. The female slaves, exposed of necessity, to the unbridled lusts of the whites, are made the instruments through whom the Caucasian race is itself reduced to the condition of servitude. "The laws of all the Southern States," says the Richmond Enquirer,

"justify the HOLDING WHITE MEN IN SLAVERY, provided, through the mother, they are descended, however remotely, from a negro slave." This is both the law and the fact, as to Southern slavery. The blood of orators, statesmen, generals and even Presidents, flows in the veins of thousands, who are bought and sold like mules and horses. The "white negro, Phil," who had the misfortune to belong to "the estate of William Gooch," and who, very probably, was Wm. Gooch's son, is only one of a class, already numerous, and of necessity, growing more numerous. The time is not distant, when the genuine, unmixed African will not be found at the South. He is already rare, although it is less than half a century since the prohibition of the foreign slave trade.

The Southern defenders of slavery, who understand perfectly well what the tendency of events is, see that they must place their institution upon some more stable basis, than the race and color of the enslaved.

Mr. Fitzhugh, a Southern writer, says:

"We do not adopt the theory that Ham was the ancestor of the negro race. The Jewish slaves were not negroes; and to confine the justification of slavery to that race, would be to weaken its scriptural authority, and to lose the whole weight of profane authority; for we read of no negro slavery in ancient times." . . . "Slavery, BLACK OR WHITE, is right and necessary."

A South Carolina paper, says:

"The great evil of Northern *free* society is, that it is burdened with a *servile* class of MECHANICS and LABORERS, unfit for self-government, and yet clothed with the attributes and powers of citizens. Master and Slave is a relation in society as necessary as that of parent and child; and the Northern States will yet have to introduce it. Slavery is the natural and normal condition of the laboring man, whether WHITE or black!"

The Richmond (Va.) Enquirer, says:

"Until recently, the defence of Slavery has labored under great difficulties, because its apologists, (for they were mere apologists,) took half-way grounds. They confined the defence of Slavery to mere negro Slavery; thereby giving up the Slavery principle, admitting other forms of Slavery to be wrong.

The line of defence, however, is now changed. The South now maintains that Slavery is right, natural, and necessary.

While it is far more obvious that negroes should be slaves, than whites, for they are only fit to labor, not to direct, yet the principle of slavery is itself right, and does not depend on difference of complexion."

WHO ARE AND MAY BE SLAVEOWNERS.

Anybody who has the means, without regard to race, nativity, religion, or character, may buy slaves for any purpose, whether of convenience, gain, display, or lust.

It is stated in a note on the 95th page of the Compendium of the Census of 1850, that "an experiment in one Southern town" gives the following results as to the nativities of 250 slaveowners.

Born in slave States,	135
Born in free States,	66
Born in foreign countries,	49

In Mohammedan countries, a Christian is not allowed to be the master of Mohammedan slaves. Americans are more catholic. Anybody, Jew, Turk, or Heathen, may come here and buy Christian slaves. Many Jews avail themselves of the privilege. Rich Englishmen and Frenchmen may, and do come over to this country, and buy in the

market, the sons and daughters of members of the American Congress.

The North American Indians in the U. States, hold an immense number of slaves.

Negroes legally may be, and often are, slave-owners. It has been stated on Southern authority, that a manumitted slave, who has made himself rich in the Western part of South Carolina, owns many slaves. There is nothing to prevent the wealthy negroes of New York, of whom there are several, going South and buying slaves of any color, even white ones like "Phil," who formed a part of "the estate of Wm. Gooch."

It is popularly supposed that masters at the South are "whites," and the slaves "blacks," or "Africans." The truth is, the law of Southern slavery does not prescribe any color, or race, for either masters, or slaves, and in point of fact, the institution does not rest upon distinction of race at all.

INCREASE IN VALUE OF SLAVES SINCE 1790.

Mr. Seaman in his Progress of Nations, states that the average value of slaves in the United States about the year 1790, was "less than one hundred dollars."

In a debate upon the Slave Trade in the United States House of Representatives in 1790, of which an account is given in the 4th volume of Elliott's Debates, Elbridge Gerry of Massachusetts, afterwards Vice President of the United States, is reported to have gone into a calculation, showing that the whole value of slaves in "the Southern States" at that time, did not exceed ten millions of dollars. As the number of these slaves amounted then to six hundred and fifty thousands, he must have computed their average value at about sixteen dollars. This seems low, and it is possible that, as was not uncommon at that period, he excluded Virginia and Maryland from the category of "Southern States."

That the value of slaves at that period was very small, is apparent from the Act of Congress of July, 9, 1798, directing valuations, and the act of Congress of July 14, 1798, imposing a direct tax upon the States, being the first direct tax imposed by the government of the United States.

As direct taxes are apportioned upon the States, on the basis of federal population, these valuations did not affect the proportionate quotas of the States, as compared with each other. They only affected the relative burdens of different descriptions of property within the States, and Congress was doubtless governed in this particular by the wishes of the representatives of the different States.

The Act of July 9, 1798, requires merely an enumeration of "all slaves, above the age of twelve, and under the age of fifty years, except such as from fixed infirmity, or bodily disability, may be incapable of labor."

The Act of July 14, 1798, taxes dwelling houses, by a scale ascending with their value, as follows:

Valued at	Rate of Tax
From \$100 to \$500	Two Mills.
" \$500 to \$1,000	Three "
" \$1,000 to \$3,000	Four "
" \$3,000 to \$6,000	Five "

And the ascending scale was continued up to houses exceeding \$30,000 in value, which were taxed one per cent.

For slaves, of the description enumerated by the Act of July 9, 1798, their owners were assessed fifty cents each.

As the slaves not enumerated at all, because less than twelve, and more than fifty years of age, constitute forty-five per cent of the whole number, the framers of this act must have computed the average value of the entire slave population, at about sixty-two dollars each, if, as may be assumed, they intended to tax the slaves, as they did the houses valued at from one to three thousand dollars, the average class of houses occupied by the owners of slaves. Upon the principle that the law does not care about trifles, *de minimis lex non curat*, this Act provided for a mere enumeration of slaves within certain ages, without distinction of sex or capacity. The Act of July 22, 1813, directing valuations preparatory to the second direct tax, after slaves had become more valuable, dropped this sweeping method of enumeration, and provided for individual valuation. The difference in value between Cæsar and Pompey and Dinah, had, in the meantime, become appreciable.

In 1813, slaves were valued in Maryland at an average of one hundred and thirty dollars each; in North Carolina at an average of one hundred and ninety dollars each. These figures are quoted by Mr. Seaman in his Progress of Nations, as taken from returns made under the Act of July 22, 1813: and from an examination and comparison of the values affixed in these returns, to various descriptions of property, Mr. Seaman is satisfied that these figures represent the true and actual valuation of slaves in those States at that period.

In Pitkins' View, as a part of aggregate valuations of houses, lands and slaves in the United States in 1814 and '15, it is assumed that 1,200,000 slaves may have been included at an average of two hundred and fifty dollars each. Mr. Pitkins, however, considers all these estimates too high, in consequence of the great depreciation of money, which followed the suspension of specie payments during the progress of the war of 1812—15.

According to the returns of the censuses taken in 1850, the valuation of slaves in the several States ranged between three and four hundred dollars each, that is, of all ages and conditions. It is now most commonly computed at five hundred dollars. This last valuation is adopted in the address of the slaveholders who convened at Lexington, Missouri, in the month of September last. On this basis, the total value of the slaves in the United States, is about two thousand millions of dollars, being an augmentation of two hundred fold in the two generations since the computation of Elbridge Gerry.

In an address to his constituents, published in the National Intelligencer of July 30, 1856, Mr. Pratt, United States Senator from Maryland says:—"The value of the slave property of the South is not less than two thousand millions of dollars, a sum equal to the value of one-fourth of all the other property in the United States, as shown by the last census."

VALUE OF SLAVES STILL INCREASING.

The rise in the value of slaves since 1850, is

about thirty per cent. and is still going on, and perhaps, at a more rapid rate than ever before.

The Winchester (Va.) Republican, (January, 1856) says:

"THE HIRINGS.—There was an active demand for servants this season, and hiring consequently commanded high figures. Able bodied farm hands brought from \$100 to \$130; women from \$40 to \$60; boys from \$30 to \$70; and girls from \$20 to \$35 according to age. From the heavy prices paid everywhere in this region, it is evident that the rate of hire has been higher this year than usual."

The Richmond (Va.) Dispatch (January, 1856), says:

"SERVANT HIRING.—In Richmond, Va., servants, both male and female are commanding higher prices this year than the past. Farm hands bring from \$130 to \$163, and women from \$40 to \$75 per year. Factory hands have advanced about 15 per cent. on last year, and first rate female cooks, of good character and without encumbrance, have advanced even above that ratio."

The Baltimore Sun of January 11, 1856, says:

"At the annual letting of slaves at Charlottesville, (Va.) farm laborers brought from \$110 to \$135; and women from \$50 to \$70."

The Richmond (Va.) Dispatch (January, 1856), has the following paragraph:

"ENORMOUS PRICES.—At the sale of the slaves of F. St. Gal, deceased, in Halifax county, a few days since, among other enormous high prices, one man brought \$1,410; and another \$1,425, both of whom were re-sold privately the same day at an advance of \$50 each. They were not considered No. 1 in any respect, and were ordinary field hands. A woman and two small children brought over \$1,500."

The Lake Providence (La.) Herald, quoted (March 1856) in the Washington Union, says:

"At the sale of Gen. L. J. Polk's negroes, at auction, on yesterday, by Wm. L. Knox, sheriff and auctioneer, negro men ranged from \$1,500 to \$1,635, women and girls from \$1,250 to \$1,550, children in proportion—all cash. Such a sale we venture to say has never been equalled in the State of Louisiana."

The Baltimore Sun of April 29, 1856, says:

"ENORMOUS PRICES FOR SLAVES.—The Lynchburg Virginian states that several slaves belonging to Mr. Geo. G. Curle, were sold in that city on Thursday at the following high figures:

Shadrach, about 70 years old, \$100; Samuel \$1,120; Mac \$2,110; Willis \$1,900; Pamel, aged 55, \$1,610; Peter \$1,401; Robin \$1,350; John \$1,250; Charles \$1,580; Jack \$1,770; Woodson \$1,320; John Mac \$1,740; Pleasant \$1,500; Dick \$1,375. The average price is over \$1,400 each, and the aggregate amount \$19,835. They were all bought by citizens of Lynchburg."

The Richmond (Va.) Whig, of April 20th, 1856, says:—

"At a public sale of personal property last Saturday, in Winchester, a likely young negro woman, about 20 years of age, was bought by a Jefferson farmer for \$1,700, being the highest price ever paid in that county within recollection."

A correspondent of the St. Louis Republican, writing from Pike County, Missouri, gives the following account of the rates at which negroes were sold and hired there on the first of January 1856:

"Mr. Editor: Negro men sold on yesterday at the following prices:—\$1,335, \$1,642, \$1,465, \$1,215, \$1,275.—These men were common crop hands, ranging from 30 to 45 years of age. Women brought from eight to nine hundred dollars, and one went as high as \$1,040; and

another as high as \$1,753. These two last good house servants and seamstresses. The women bringing \$500 and \$900 were over middle age.

While negroes sold for these prices, they hired at corresponding rates; common farm hands, young and likely hired for \$220 to \$232; boys of 15 and 17 years of age, or thereabouts, hired for \$140 and \$150—in every instance, the individual hiring, and not the owner, paying all charges of every description."

The Richmond (Va.) Dispatch, quoted in the Baltimore Sun of July 23, 1856, says:—

"HIGH PRICE FOR SLAVES.—There has been a greater demand for slaves in this city during the months of May, June and July, than ever known before, and they have commanded better prices during that time. This latter is an unusual thing, as the summer months are generally the dulllest in the year for that description of property. Prime field hands (women) will now bring from \$1,000 to \$1,100, and men, from \$1,250 to \$1,500. Not long since a likely negro girl sold in this city at private sale for \$1,700. A large number of negroes are bought on speculation, and probably there is not less than \$2,000,000 in town now, seeking investment in such property."

While such has been, and is the advance of slave prices, the most extravagant anticipations as to the future are indulged in by the slave interest. Gov. Wise, of Virginia, insists, that if Mr. Buchanan's policy of extending the Missouri Compromise line to the Pacific had succeeded, slaves now worth one thousand dollars, would be worth five, or at least three thousand dollars, to be worked in the California gold mines. Gov. Wise estimates that the value of negroes in Virginia alone, would have been augmented over one thousand millions of dollars by that policy. The purpose of his arguments, addressed to the South, was to show how much the value of negro property is liable to be affected by the movements of the government, and to deduce the importance of placing the administration in the hands of a man like Buchanan, whose fidelity to the South has been often tried, and never found wanting.

CAUSES OF THE INCREASED VALUE OF SLAVES.

The opinion most generally received, is, that slaves have increased in value within sixty years past, in consequence, first, of the development of the cotton culture, and secondly, of the constant enlargement of the areas upon which they are worked. The acquisition of Louisiana; the removal of the Indians from Georgia, Mississippi and Alabama, commenced and consummated during the administration of Gen. Jackson; and, finally, the conquest of Texas by slavery, followed by the annexation of that extensive country to the United States;—these are the prominent events which have opened large bodies of new and rich lands to slave occupation, and have kept up the demand for that species of labor.

It is not doubtful that the events referred to have increased the value of slaves, but another cause has been, and still is at work in the same direction. It is a matter of common observation and knowledge, that the wages of free labor have notably risen in the United States during the last generation, and it will be found upon examination that this rise in wages has been going on steadily during the present century, both in this country and in Great Britain. This rise is real, and not apparent merely. It is not a rise simply in money price, but by comparing the variations in wages, with the variations in the price of other commodities, it will be found that the condition of the

laborer has been substantially improved, and that his command of the comforts of life has been constantly increasing. Some articles of food have risen in price, but none at a greater rate than that of the rise in wages; and on the other hand the cost of clothing, and of manufactured articles generally, has largely diminished. The change in the position of labor is seen most clearly in the condition of farm laborers and house servants. They are unaffected by any change in the price of food, and they find that the money wages, of which they receive twice what they did a generation back, will command vastly more than formerly of the commodities which they are obliged to purchase.

Now, the same causes, whatever they may be believed to be, which have improved the situation of the free laborer at the North, have raised the value of slaves at the South. The two systems of labor, slave and free, affect each other. In Maryland, Virginia, Kentucky and Missouri, and to a certain extent, in Tennessee, and other Southern States, slave labor is directed to precisely the same forms and objects which employ the free labor in Pennsylvania and the Western States. It is impossible that there should be a rise in the wages of free laborers, without a corresponding rise in the annual hire and selling price of slaves.

It would not be suitable to the character of the present discussion, to enter upon the wide field of controversy which is presented by opposing theories of political economy. It is agreed, however, that capital is the fund out of which wages are paid, and that the condition of the laborer will depend, other things being equal, upon the proportion between the aggregate of moveable capital and the number of laborers.

During the last half century of general peace and prosperity, the augmentation of capital has been more rapid than the increase in the number of laborers. Wages have therefore risen, and so has the value of slaves. It is impossible to foresee the extent to which the continued rise may be carried. So far, it is certainly not fictitious, but rests upon a solid basis.

THE TRUE REASON OF THE CHANGE OF SOUTHERN OPINIONS UPON SLAVERY.

At the period of the formation of the Constitution of the United States, the system of slavery found no favor, except in Georgia and South Carolina and Georgia. The great men of Virginia were unanimous in its condemnation, and looked forward hopefully to its abolition. As late as 1796, General Washington wrote to Sir John Sinclair, that laws providing for the extinction of slavery, already adopted in Pennsylvania, could not long be delayed in Maryland and Virginia.

Even long after schemes of abolition were given up, and long after the South seemed to abandon itself to slavery, as a hopeless and irremediable evil, the system was not supported as being a good one in itself and in the abstract. It is only lately that the South has undertaken the advocacy of slavery as a positive good, and has demanded its extension as such into new regions.

It is said that this change of Southern views is to be attributed to the interference of the abolitionists. The suggestion has neither fact, nor plac

sibility to rest upon. The spirit of abolitionism has been dying out in this country since the epoch of the Revolution. That was an era of generous feelings. Liberty was a substantial reality, for which the men of that day had perilled their lives and fortunes. To that age of political "*chivalry*" has succeeded an age of "*calculators*." It is egregiously untrue, that desire for, or effort for, the abolition of slavery in this country, has increased within the past half century, or that the change of attitude on the part of the South, in reference to that institution, finds its cause, or its justification, in the movements of abolitionists. The explanation of the whole thing is clear and plain. The working and breeding of slaves have become profitable, and it is the sordid love of gain, and that alone, which has debauched and demoralized Southern opinion. The whole thing is a matter of dollars and cents. In what country, or in what age, have we seen such a gigantic aggregation of capital in a single description of personal property, as in this two thousand millions of dollars in slaves, which will certainly be duplicated by the natural increase of numbers in a single generation, and which will probably be carried to ten millions by the continuing appreciation of its value?

The Virginians, especially, seem absolutely to glory in their shame. "*We propose*," says the Richmond (Va.) Enquirer, "*to introduce no more slaves into the country, but by their dispersion and diffusion over a large space, to INCREASE THEIR VALUE.*" This is the undisguised and avowed object of the whole policy of slavery extension, of which the subjugation of Kansas is a part.

Consider for one moment, how enormously profitable this system of slave breeding has become to Virginians. The slave infant is reckoned to be worth one hundred dollars at the moment of birth, and to gain fifty dollars yearly in value. The slave child at five years of age, who has not cost the Virginia master (and perhaps father,) half as much money as a horse reared to the same age by the Northern farmer, will command six times as much in the market.

The use of this language in reference to the rearing of rational and immortal beings, is as disagreeable to the writer, as it can be to the reader, but it is rendered imperative by the facts in the case.

The number of slaves in Virginia, was in—

1830,	469,757
1850,	472,528

The annual increase, not less than 14,000, has been sold. The annual sales would amount to seven millions of dollars, if the sales embraced only an average of conditions and ages, but in truth, as the more valuable slaves are sent to market, the aggregate is much higher. This business of slave breeding is the great business of Virginia, and completely controls its political opinions and movements. Virginia negroes are as regularly and constantly advertised in the New Orleans papers, as the hemp of Kentucky, or the corn of Illinois.

Considered either as an aggregation of capital, or in reference to profits, the slave interest has become the leading interest in this country. It is worth eight times as much as our entire mercantile tonnage, and pays more than eight times as much annual profit. It controls public opinion, controls newspapers and politicians, and moulds the foreign

and domestic policy of the government to its own purposes.

Let us consider some of the steps in its progress during the past two generations, and observe, that while the South has been growing more exacting and more aggressive, the resistance of the North seems to have become feebler and feebler.

THE COMPROMISE OF 1804.

On the 26th day of March, 1804, the Congress of the United States, acted for the first time on the question of slavery in the Territories, under circumstances which left it free to act according to its own judgment. In legislating hitherto in reference to the Territories east of the Mississippi, it had been controlled, in reference to what was North of the Ohio river, by the famous ordinance of 1787, and in reference to what was South of the Ohio river, by the claims and terms of cession of Georgia and North Carolina. In 1804, in legislating upon the Territory of Louisiana acquired the previous year, Congress proceeded unembarrassed and untrammelled, to give legislative expression to its views in reference to slavery.

What was done may be found (U. S. Statutes at Large, vol. 2, page 283.) in an Act approved March 26, 1804, entitled "*An Act creating Louisiana into two Territories, and providing for the temporary government thereof.*"

By this Act, all South of the parallel of 33°, being the present State of Louisiana, was organized by itself under the name of the "*Territory of Orleans.*"

In respect to this Territory of Orleans, the 10th section prohibits the bringing in of slaves from a foreign country; also the bringing in of slaves from any part of the United States, who may have been brought into the United States after the 1st of May, 1798; and finally provides as follows:—

"No slave, or slaves, shall directly or indirectly be introduced into said Territory, except by a citizen of the United States, removing into said Territory for actual settlement, and being at the time of such removal bona fide owner of such slave, or slaves; and every slave imported or brought into said Territory, contrary to the provisions of this act, shall thereupon be entitled to, and receive his, or her freedom."

By the 12th section of same Act, as to the balance of the Territory, it was provided as follows:—

"The residue of the province of Louisiana, ceded to the United States, shall be called the district of Louisiana, the government whereof shall be organized and administered as follows:—

The executive power now vested in the governor of the Indiana Territory, shall extend to, and be exercised in the said district of Louisiana. The Governor and Judges of the Indiana Territory shall have power to establish, in the said district of Louisiana, inferior courts, and prescribe their jurisdiction and duties, and to make all laws which they may deem conducive to the good government of the inhabitants thereof."

The Act is totally silent as to slavery in the "*residue of the province of Louisiana,*" north of 33° and so are the debates, as preserved in the Annals of Congress. The severe restrictions upon the carrying of slaves into what is now the State of Louisiana, were debated at length, although carried

by decisive votes, but there is not one word as to the "district of Louisiana" North of 33°. Manifestly, Congress had no expectation that slavery would go into this region at all. To suppose otherwise, is to suppose Congress guilty of the folly of setting up many and high barriers to the ingress of slaves South of 33°, and leaving the whole territory North open to them. Not only is it plain that Congress did not anticipate the entrance of slaves into the "district of Louisiana," but it appears also, that Congress took what might have seemed a sufficient precaution against it, by placing the district under the law making power of the Governor and Judges of the Indiana Territory, which was free Territory under the ordinance of 1787.

It turned out, in point of fact, that the Governor and Judges of Indiana Territory, adopted a code of laws under which slavery found legal shelter in what now constitutes the States of Missouri and Arkansas. It turned out, in point of fact, that into this region, North of 33°, into which Congress did not contemplate the carrying of slaves at all, they were carried without any of the restrictions so carefully imposed South of 33°. How instructive the lesson, that in dealing with slavery it is never safe to trust anything to mere probabilities, but always necessary to close every door with bolts and bars of iron.

Whether this evasion of the intentions of Congress in 1804, was originally a matter of cunning and design on the part of slavery, or whether it merely grew up in the course of events, is a question not determinable with certainty after this lapse of time. There can be no question at all, as to what the intentions and expectations of Congress actually were. If their intentions had not been baffled by the unanticipated action of the Governor and Judges of Indiana Territory, the Southern line of freedom West of the Mississippi, would have been the line of 33°. So long as the statutes of the Country remain, so long will the proof remain, that that was as far North as the men of 1804, would suffer slavery to go. The parallel of 33° was, in short, the compromise of 1804.

By the legislation of 1820, the dividing line between slavery and freedom was carried North to 36° 40'. By the Kansas legislation of 1854, slavery was carried North to the line of 40°, thus, at two bounds, making a Northward progress of seven degrees of latitude, in the space of fifty years.

IMPORTANCE OF KANSAS.

Kansas, with its fertile soil and delightful climate, comprising over one hundred and fifty odd thousand square miles, extending over three degrees of latitude, and (in its greatest length), thirteen degrees of longitude, is still more important from its geographical position. It is the key of the great West beyond the Mississippi. It is the only route by which slavery can move towards the Pacific. Cut off from Kansas, slavery can seek extension only to the southward, and along the Gulf of Mexico. Kansas touches Utah, touches New Mexico, and is only separated by half a degree from Northern Texas. The institutions of Kansas will, in a not distant future, control those of the Indian Territory lying to the south of it. If Kansas is free,

it is conceded on all hands, that slavery cannot be maintained in Missouri, as it would then be surrounded on three sides by free territory; and when slavery falls in Missouri, free institutions are brought to the borders of Arkansas and Tennessee. Possessing Kansas, slavery is fixed as the dominant power on this continent for indefinite ages. Losing Kansas, slavery must cease forever its struggle for empire. Such, and so vast are the issues which depend upon a decision soon to be made by the American people. That decision will be irremediable and irreversible. To the one side, or the other, it will bring a victory complete, decisive and overwhelming. Kansas must be free, or it must be slave. There is no middle term.

The men of the South, ever vigilant, never off their guard, appreciate the crisis, and will act with the unanimity and vigor, inspired by common interest and common hopes.

Judge Atkison, of Missouri, in his appeal to citizens of Georgia, says:—

"We must have the support of the South. We are fighting the battles of the South. Kansas must have slave institutions, or Missouri must have free institutions."

Mayor W. D. Wilkes, sent by the pro-slavery party in Kansas to Charleston, South Carolina, to solicit aid, makes the following appeal to the Executive Committee raised in that city, to assist pro-slavery emigration to Kansas:—

"First. By consent of parties, the present contest in Kansas is made the turning point in the destinies of slavery and abolitionism. If the South triumphs, abolitionism will be defeated, and shorn of its power for all time. If she is defeated, abolitionism will grow more insolent and aggressive, until the utter ruin of the South is consummated.

Second. If the South secures Kansas, she will extend slavery into all territory south of the fortieth degree parallel of north latitude to the Rio Grande, and this of course will secure for her pent up institutions of slavery an ample outlet, and restore her power in Congress. If the North secures Kansas, the power of the South in Congress will be gradually diminished. The States of Missouri, Kentucky, Tennessee, Arkansas and Texas, together with the adjacent territories, will gradually become abolitionized."

Hon. W. W. Boyce, M. C., from South Carolina, writes home from Washington, as published in the Winsboro' (S. C.) Register:

"It is impossible to exaggerate the importance of Kansas to the South. If we lose Kansas we lose Missouri, bring freesoil to the borders of Arkansas and Tennessee, and will have to struggle for the Indian Country behind Arkansas. Kansas is emphatically the key to the future; and if we would command the future, we must command Kansas."

At a public meeting in Charleston (S. C.) W. B. Faber, the editor of the Mercury, said:

"What are we to do? Look on the map for Kansas. See the post she occupies. The North has sixteen States, the South fifteen. In the United States Senate the North casts two more votes than we; the House of Representatives is absolutely of the North. Give them Kansas—they have two more votes in the Senate, and the whole country becomes abolitionized. The same cry swells from Maine to Iowa, 'No more slave States!' It goes forth from the pulpit, is the burden of teachings in Sabbath schools, in every condition, in every stage of life. Let that cry be the precursor of success to its utterers, and farewell to the bright anticipations, the fond dreams for the future of Southern institutions, which we have looked forward to seeing embraced in the arms of a Southern Confederacy, and proudly defying the world to strike! Kansas lies at the very gate of the West—on the route of the great Pacific Railroad—she stands out a very promontory in the Union. If free institutions gain footing on her soil—if she is added to the ranks of the fanat-

ices, then follow Missouri and Arkansas—all to abolitionism. If Kansas is made free, where next can slavery advance to the West? Not through the Indian territories—not through Iowa—it is swept back and encompassed literally, absolutely."

SLAVERY AND WAR.

The Ostend conferences proclaimed war, the Cincinnati platform proclaims war, whenever war becomes necessary for the extension and aggrandisement of Slavery. *It is not safe to place the government in the keeping of a single pecuniary interest, and that interest a peculiar one, and having no connection with, or dependence upon, the other interests and pursuits of the community.* Men are governed by their own interests, and not by the interests of others. If the acquisition of Cuba, although at the expense of a war, would add to the security and value of slave property, does anybody believe that Toombs of Georgia, Wise of Virginia, Quitman of Mississippi, and their associates would be deterred from war, by the consideration that it would annihilate Northern commerce? Seriously, is it not more probable that the certain destruction of Northern commerce, would be, to such men, rather a persuasive to war, than an objection to it? Can the Northern States, with any prudence, trust their interests to men, who have no interests in common with them? The Southern planter both hates and despises the "Northern shopkeeper." If the Southern planter wants war, he will have it, and none the less readily, because it will crush a class he always disliked. The Cincinnati platform means war. It is, in fact, a declaration of war on its face. War is inevitable under the administration of the man who declares himself to be the embodiment of that platform. Is the North willing to sacrifice both its interests and its principles, for the sake of still further enhancing the value of Southern property?

IS SLAVERY A POSITIVE GOOD.

In the discussions maintained in former times with the Abolitionists, Southern men admitted that slavery was *an* civil, and deplored the errors and misfortunes which had entailed it upon them. In the present discussions with the Republicans, they are obliged to maintain that slavery is a positive good, because, upon no ground can they justify its extension into regions where it does not exist. Accordingly, they do maintain this new doctrine.

The Charleston (S. C.) Mercury says:

"The ensuing Presidential canvass, which will probably determine the fate of the Union, will turn almost *solely on the question of State equality.* NONE CAN CONSISTENTLY OR EFFECTIVELY CONTEND FOR STATE EQUALITY, who do not hold that the institutions of the South, and the social forms of the South, are equally *rightful, legitimate, moral and promotive of human happiness and well-being, with those of the North.* If slave society be inferior in these respects to free society, we of the South are wrong and criminal in proposing to extend it to new territory, and the North right in exerting itself to the utmost to prevent such extension. Nay, more; if slave society be an inferior social organization, we should all become at least gradual emancipationists. But we go further. We must contend that ours is the *best form of*

society; for social organisms, so opposite as those of the North and the South cannot be equally well suited to people in all other respects so exactly alike. We must *surrender the doctrine of State equality and of Slavery extension, unless we are prepared to meet the attacks of Black Republicanism on our institutions, by making equally vigorous assaults on theirs."*

The Richmond Enquirer says:

"THE TRUE ISSUE.—The Democrats of the South in the pending canvass, cannot rely on the *old grounds of apology* and excuse for slavery; for they seek not merely to retain it where it is, *but to extend it into regions where it is unknown.* Much less can they rely on the mere constitutional guarantees of slavery, for such reliance is pregnant with the admission that slavery is wrong, and but for the constitution should be abolished.

Nor will it avail us aught to show that the negro is most happy and best situated in the condition of slavery. If we stop there, we weaken our cause by the very argument intended to advance it: *for we propose to introduce into new territory human beings whom we assert to be unfit for liberty, self-government and equal association with other men.* We must go a step farther. We must show that African slavery is a *moral, religious, natural, and probably in the general, a necessary institution of society.* This is the only line of argument that will enable Southerners to maintain the doctrine of State equality and slavery extension.

For if slavery be not a legitimate, useful, moral and expedient institution, we cannot, without reproach of conscience and the blush of shame, seek to extend it, or assert our equality with those States having no such institution."

The Northern supporters of Mr. Buchanan, who have courage enough to be frank, hold substantially the same language.

The N. Y. Day Book of April 14, 1856.

"Slavery Extension.—The Boston Post says it is a libel on the Democracy to say that they are in favor of slavery extension. Well, then, of course they are opposed to its extension. So is Greeley, and Seward, and Hale, and Chase, the men and the party which the Post opposes or assumes to oppose. There is no escape from this conclusion. "Slavery extension" is the sole question before the country, for Know Nothingism is merely a galvanized corpse, without life or motion beyond that imparted to it by the artificial stimuli of political necromancy. We repeat, "slavery," negro slavery, and negro slavery extension, is the sole question before the country, and to be determined in the approaching Presidential election, and as Mr. Senator Seward, above all other public men of the day, embodies the opposition to this slavery extension, the Democracy, if opposed to it in common with Mr. Seward, should at once make him President; and the Boston Post, if opposed to this extension of slavery, should join heart and hand in placing the man above all others truly embodying that opposition, in the Presidential chair, for the good and substantial reason that the opposition would be the most effective when thus represented. But the Democracy are not opposed to slavery extension, or that which ignorance and delusion term slavery extension, and the time is at hand when those who assume to speak for it must understand what they are doing in the matter, or they had better hold their tongues, aye, had better cut out their tongues a thousand times over rather than thus help to mystify and bewilder, and indeed debase the common sense of the people."

Can the North, with its well settled opinions in relation to slavery, permit it to be extended over Kansas, and the still vaster regions whose fate depends upon that of Kansas, *"without reproach of conscience and the blush of shame?"* Or shall smooth-tongued pleaders be permitted *"to mystify and bewilder, and indeed debase the common sense of the people?"*

NORTHERN OPINION IN TIMES PAST.

Volumes might be filled with the proofs that the North has been gradually receding from the anti-slavery opinions of purer and better times.

To show the minds once held at the North, let us turn to the records of the great and patriotic and conservative State of Pennsylvania, well entitled, both by geographical position and political merit, to be called the Keystone of the Federal Arch.

On the 11th day of December, 1819, Mr. Duane moved the following preamble and resolution in the Legislature of Pennsylvania, in reference to the admission of Missouri:

"A measure was ardently supported in the last Congress of the United States, and will probably be as earnestly urged during the existing session of that body, which has a palpable tendency to impair the political relations of the several States, which is calculated to mar the social happiness of the present and future generations, which if adopted, would impede the march of humanity and freedom through the world, and would transfer from a misguided ancestry an odious stain and fix it indelibly upon the present race—a measure, in brief, which proposes to spread the crimes and cruelties of Slavery from the banks of the Mississippi to the shores of the Pacific:

When a measure of this character is seriously advocated in the republican Congress of America, in the nineteenth century, the several States are invoked by the duty which they owe to the Deity, by the veneration which they entertain for the memory of the founders of the republic, and by a tender regard for posterity, to protest against its adoption, to refuse to covenant with crime, and to limit the range of an evil that already hangs in awful boding over so large a portion of the Union. Nor can such a protest be entered by any State with greater propriety than by Pennsylvania: this commonwealth has as sacredly respected the rights of other States, as it has been careful of its own; it has been the inviolable aim of the people of Pennsylvania to extend to the universe, by their example, the unadulterated blessings of civil and religious freedom, and it is their pride that they have been at all times the practical advocates of those improvements and charities among men, which are so well calculated to enable them to answer the purpose of their Creator; and above all they may boast that they were foremost in removing the pollution of slavery from among them.

If, indeed, the measure against which Pennsylvania considers it her duty to raise her voice, was calculated to abridge any of the rights guaranteed to the several States; if, odious as slavery is, it was proposed to hasten its extinction by means injurious to the States upon which it was unhappily entailed, Pennsylvania would be among the first to insist upon a sacred observance of the constitutional compact. But it cannot be pretended that the rights of any of the States are at all to be affected by refusing to extend the mischiefs of human bondage over the boundless regions of the west; a territory which formed no part of the Union at the adoption of the constitution; which has been but lately purchased from an European power by the people of the Union at large; which may or may not be admitted as a State into the Union at the discretion of Congress; which must establish a republican form of government, and no other; and whose climate affords none of the pretenses urged for resorting to the labor of natives of the torrid zone; such a territory has no right

inherent or acquired, such as those States possessed which established the existing constitution.

When that Constitution was framed in September, 1787, the concession that three-fifths of the slaves in the States then existing should be represented in Congress, could not have been intended to embrace regions at that time held by a foreign power. On the contrary, so anxious were the Congress of that day to confine human bondage within its ancient home, that on the 13th of July, 1787, that body unanimously declared that slavery, or involuntary servitude, should not exist in the extensive territories bounded by the Ohio, the Mississippi, Canada, and the Lakes; and in the 9th article of the Constitution itself, the power of Congress to prohibit the emigration of servile persons after 1808, is expressly recognised; nor is there to be found in the statute book a single instance of the admission of a territory to the rank of a State in which Congress have not adhered to the right vested in them by the Constitution to stipulate with the territory upon the conditions of the bond.

The Senate and House of Representatives of Pennsylvania, therefore, cannot, but deprecate any departure from the humane and enlightened policy pursued not only by the illustrious Congress which framed the Constitution, but by their successors without exception. They are persuaded that to open the fertile regions of the West to a servile race would tend to increase their numbers beyond all past example, would open a new and steady market for the lawless vendors of human flesh, and would render all schemes for obliterating this most foul blot upon the American character, useless and unavailing.

Under these convictions, and in the full persuasion that upon this topic there is but one opinion in Pennsylvania,

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, That the Senators of this State in the Congress of the United States be and they are hereby instructed, and that the Representatives of this State in the Congress of the United States be and they are hereby requested to vote against the admission of any territory as a State into the Union, unless said territory shall stipulate and agree that the further introduction of slavery or involuntary servitude, except for the punishment of crimes, whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, and shall be prohibited, and that all children born within the said territory, after its admission into the Union as a State, shall be free, but may be held to service until the age of twenty-five years."

In the House, containing 74 democrats and 20 federalist's, this preamble and resolution were unanimously adopted on a vote of yeas and nays, and afterwards received the unanimous concurrence of the Senate.

Thirty years later, in 1848, by the Democratic State Convention of Pennsylvania, held at Pittsburg, it was unanimously

Resolved, That the Democratic party adhere now, as it ever has done, to the Constitution of the country. Its letter and spirit they will neither weaken nor destroy, and they re-declare that slavery is a local, domestic institution of the South, subject to State alone, and with which the General Government has nothing to do. Wherever the State law extends its jurisdiction, the local institution can continue to exist. *Especially* it is a violation of State rights to carry it beyond State limits, we deny the power of any citizen to extend the area of bondage beyond its present dominion; nor do we consider it a part of the compromise of the Constitution, that slavery should forever travel with the advancing column of our territorial progress.